

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the in-person interview conducted with the examiner and the supervisory examiner on July 9, 2010. (The supervisor, Ms. Nguyen, participated telephonically.) On July 8, the examiner requested that Applicants submit an interview agenda in advance of the interview. During the interview Applicants summarized the points made in the agenda, explained the instant invention, and urged the patentability thereof over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,968 to Achelpohl et al ("Achelpohl"). In explaining the differences between Achelpohl's pressure medium-piston-cylinder unit and Applicants' claimed mandrel-locking unit, Applicants referred to, *inter alia*, Achelpohl's Figure 2 and Applicants' Figures 1 and 2. Applicants also referred to an annotated version of Achelpohl's Figure 2 (submitted as an attachment to the Amendment filed December 30, 2009) that serves to highlight the structural distinctions between Achelpohl's unit and Applicants' claimed invention.

As the Interview Summary indicates, agreement was reached during the interview. The examiner states that "[i]t was agreed that adding claim language defining the boundary surface to be the surface of the piston that is on the pressure chamber side of the piston would overcome the application of ["patent to"] Achelpohl et al. as made in the last Office Action."

Therefore, in the present Amendment, to advance prosecution, claims 1, 8, 11, 16, and 17 have been amended to even more particularly define the various embodiments of the invention. Claims 1-17 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 11, 16, and 17 are independent. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments. Entry of each of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Achelpohl, the rejection of claims 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achelpohl in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,562,358 to Okamoto et al. ("Okamoto"), the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achelpohl in view of Okamoto and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,954 to Rosberg et al. ("Rosberg"), and the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achelpohl in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,083,205 to Clarke et al. ("Clarke") are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the detailed remarks presented in the Amendment of December 30, 2009, the agreement reached during the interview, and the amendments and remarks presented herein.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now in condition for allowance. If the examiner believes that another

U.S. Appln. No.: 10/557,826
Atty. Docket No.: P70779US0

interview might expedite prosecution, the examiner is invited to
contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.
Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.
Reg. No. 20,851

400 Seventh Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 638-6666
Date: July 16, 2010